## UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 03-7316

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

versus

 $\begin{array}{llll} \text{MIGUEL} & \text{AVILES} & \text{MONDRAGON}, & \text{a/k/a} & \text{Manuel} \\ \text{Arrellano Munoz}, & & & & \\ \end{array}$ 

Defendant - Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of North Carolina, at Raleigh. Terrence W. Boyle, Chief District Judge. (CR-99-27-BO, CA-03-87-5-BO)

Submitted: December 3, 2003 Decided: December 30, 2003

Before NIEMEYER, MICHAEL, and GREGORY, Circuit Judges.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Miguel Aviles Mondragon, Appellant Pro Se.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit. See Local Rule 36(c).

## PER CURIAM:

Miguel Aviles Mondragon seeks to appeal the district court's order and order on reconsideration dismissing his 28 U.S.C. § 2255 (2000) motion. Mondragon cannot appeal these orders unless a circuit judge or justice issues a certificate of appealability, and a certificate of appealability will not issue absent a "substantial showing of the denial of a constitutional right." § 2253(c)(2) (2000). A habeas appellant meets this standard by demonstrating that reasonable jurists would find that his constitutional claims are debatable and that any dispositive procedural rulings by the district court are also debatable or wrong. See Miller-El v. Cockrell, 537 U.S. 322, 326 (2003); Slack v. McDaniel, 529 U.S. 473, 484 (2000); Rose v. Lee, 252 F.3d 676, 683 (4th Cir. 2001). We have independently reviewed the record and conclude Mondragon has not made the requisite showing. Accordingly, we deny a certificate of appealability and dismiss the appeal. We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the materials before the court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

DISMISSED